

## REMARKS

In response to the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, claim 1 was amended to refer to "an introduction of a 200kHz GSM-type network into a TDMA system", and claims 1 and 5 were each amended to recite "said frames comprising a number of timeslots", thereby providing antecedent basis for the statement "rotating control channels belonging to a serving time group over every other timeslot number". Support for the language that the frames comprise a number of timeslots is found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as filed. The dependent claims were also amended to replace "A method" and "A system" with "The method" and "The system", as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-9 should be free of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Further in this regard, it is submitted that the purported points of unclarity noted by the Examiner could have instead been noted as objections to the claim language, as opposed to rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As such, it is submitted that the foregoing amendments were not made for a reason related to patentability, and are merely of a cosmetic nature. This being the case, the full range of equivalents for all elements of the amended claims should remain intact.

Claims 4 and 7 were objected to as depending from a rejected claim. In response, claims 4 and 7 have been rewritten in independent form, and should be found to be allowable.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the document "3-Carrier Compact Proposal", 5/17-19, 1999, Paris, cited by the Applicants (hereafter referred to as the "3-Carrier Compact Proposal"). The rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

The Examiner notes some superficial similarities between the claimed invention and the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal, such as the use of a 52-multiframe and time groups. However, the Examiner goes on to equate the description at sub-paragraph 2 of page 4, and sub-paragraph 6

at page 5 of the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal with the claimed subject matter "rotating control channels belonging to a serving time group over every other timeslot number" found in the independent claims 1 and 5. This is simply not the case.

First, sub-paragraph 2 is believed to be found on page 2, and provides an overview of the proposed 3-Carrier Compact Proposal. Rotation *per se* is not mentioned in sub-paragraph 2. Sub-paragraph 6 (page 5) simply states that "different time groups have their common control channels on different timeslots". Rotation of timeslots *per se* is not mentioned in sub-paragraph 6. In fact, a mention of a rotation of timeslots or timeslot number is not found in the document 3-Carrier Compact Proposal, nor is it illustrated in the Figures found in the Appendix. See, for example, sub-paragraph 4 on page 3, that refers to Figures 2 and 3 of Appendix A, which shows that different time groups share the same frequency, "but split the timeslots for control signaling". It is instructive to then compare Figs. 2 and 3 of Appendix A of the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal with, for example, Figures D.5, D.6 and D.7 of Appendix A of the instant patent application, where the rotation of control channels is actually shown. No similar rotation of control channels "over every other timeslot number" is depicted in the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal.

This being the case, it should be clear as well that the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal does not disclose subject matter in the second paragraph on page 4, or paragraph 8 on page 5, that would anticipate the subject matter of claims 2, 4 and 8, as these claims further define the rotation that is clearly not disclosed or suggested by the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8 and 9, and to allow these claims.

Claims 10-14 are newly added, and are also deemed to be patentable over the disclosure found in the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal. Support for the network component is found at least in Fig. 1, and throughout the written description. No new matter is added.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejection of the claims

S.N.: 09/575,033  
Art Unit: 2666



RECEIVED

SEP 23 2004

Technology Center 2600

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on the 3-Carrier Compact Proposal, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-14 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-14 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted:

Harry F. Smith

Reg. No.: 32,493

9/16/2004

Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: hsmith@hspatent.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

9/16/2004  
Date

Elaine F. Mian  
Name of Person Making Deposit